

THE HERALD OF ANARCHY

AN ORGAN OF SOCIAL, POLITICAL, AND ECONOMIC FREETHOUGHT.

VOL. I.—No. 1]

OCTOBER, 1890.

[MONTHLY: ONE PENNY.

OUR PURPOSE.

In producing this little paper we have a definite object in view and definite principles to guide us. We intend the paper to be a short monthly exposition of Anarchist or consistent Individualist views. We shall, as far as possible, take up an unbiassed attitude in favour of individual liberty; and although we shall doubtless appear to favour the Democracy in our opinions, we shall only do so, so far as in true liberty lies the hope of the worker and producer as against that of the shirker and consumer.

If our sympathies are democratic, it is because no other class but the struggling multitude present any objects worthy of sympathy. Sir Georgius Midas has his liver complaints, and the Duchess of Longacre suffers from nervous prostration at the end of the season; but these folks know well enough how to take care of themselves.

People are very apt to confuse liberty and tyranny; they are perpetually falling into the error of thinking it is only this or that form of tyranny that is injurious, and whilst advocating measures of most unwarrantable tyranny of their own particular pet kind, think all the while that they are advancing the cause of liberty.

Such, indeed, is the position of almost all supposed "friends of the people" at the present moment. It is, indeed, interesting to observe how they all follow one another like a flock of sheep into the ranks of Toryism, all seeking for temporary popular approbation rather than earnestly going to the root of social evils and taking a firm stand under the time-honoured banner of Freedom.

It is doubtful whether the Editor of the *Herald of Anarchy* will be classed as a "friend of the people." In favour of freedom of contract! A champion of blacklegism! Yet such is our position. Is society in a bad way? Is labour oppressed and robbed? Our motto is, "Abstain from tyranny, for force is no remedy." Time will show whether the tyranny of trade unionism or of shallow democratic legislation has conferred one iota of benefit upon the working man in particular or society in general.

Our position, therefore will be that of an unswerving advocate of liberty, and we shall seek to show how faith in liberty can set the workman free from his present troubles.

But we have a further object in view. It is to advocate thoroughgoing *Individualism*, feeling as we do that this term has been long enough misrepresented by a set of men who evidently do not know what they are talking about when they use the term. Hence the reason why Individualistic ideas have found so little favour with workmen, and why they have gone in almost *en masse* for Socialism.

The term Individualism would, one might imagine, be easily understood, especially by such educated men as Mr. Auberon Herbert, Mr. J. H. Levy, and by the various noble lords—lords by their own individual merits, of course—of the Liberty and Property Defence League. But, taking Individualism to mean the principle of self-reliance, it is strange that all these gentlemen stop short in their logic and do not seem to think that the principle of self-reliance in itself is good, but only in particular cases, State reliance being apparently good in other particular cases, which these gentlemen select—no doubt under the influence of divine inspiration.

We shall advocate that the individual should be left alone as much as possible. It may be difficult sometimes to decide when one man is trespassing on the liberty of others, but we advocate that the question should always be decided by voluntary associations, and that Government is bad in all cases.

To talk of Government being necessary in order to maintain the "maximum degree of freedom" is, of course, mere hypocritical bunkum, for it at once overrides the freedom of refusing to support the Government. Such so-called Individualists, therefore, who make use of this cant phrase in order to avoid shocking respectable audiences by taking up a consistent position, are at heart tyrants, and their advocacy of liberty is of that selfish and narrow variety which will never create much impression upon mankind.

OUR PROGRAM.*

We have not much faith in programs—they have a political smack; and we simply put one forward in order to give our readers a general idea of our economic views. The following are the principal economic ideas of Anarchists:—

1. *Free Exchange.* That is, untrammelled by any laws relating to money, banking, and property.

2. *Free Land.* That is, the abolition of property in living space.

3. *Abolition of all forms of Taxation,* customs and duties being only roundabout methods adopted by Governments to get people to pay for services they don't require.

4. *Enforcement of Contract,* by the agency of associations for publishing the names of untrustworthy persons, and by other means.

5. *Free Police Force,* for protecting possessions where necessary. With the establishment of equitable exchanges, however, there would be but little incentive to robbery.

6. *Free Postal Associations,* the Post Office monopoly being a stupid monstrosity instituted and perpetuated for the purpose of maintaining authority.

7. *Abolition of all Monopolies and Licenses,* whether of trading in alcoholic liquors and tobacco, or in education, practice of medicine, amusements, etc., etc.

In short, we claim that, as it is neither necessary nor would be beneficial for the State to bake our bread, wash our clothes, build our houses, or print our books, so it is neither necessary nor beneficial for the State to issue our money, protect our property, enforce our contracts, carry our letters, or guard our morals.

CAPITAL AND INTEREST.

ADAPTED FROM PROUDHON.

The aim of the Revolution is to found the absolute liberty of the individual and of the citizen.

The formula of the Revolution in the economic order is the organisation of credit and of circulation, which means the absorption of the quality of capitalist in that of worker. No doubt this formula alone does not give the complete intelligence of the system; it is only the point of departure of it, the *aphorism*. But it suffices to explain the Revolution in its actuality and its immediacy; consequently it authorises us to say that the Revolution is that, and cannot be anything else.

All that tends to develop the Revolution thus conceived, all that favours the development of it, no matter whence it comes, is essentially revolutionary. We class it in the category of *movement*.

All that is opposed to the application of this idea, all that denies or impedes it, whether it be the product of demagogism or of absolutism, we call resistance. If the author of this resistance be the Government, or if it act in connivance with the Government, it becomes *reaction*.

Resistance is legitimate when it is in good faith, and when it is accomplished within the limits of liberty. Then it is only the consecration of free examination, the sanction of individual liberty.

Reaction, on the contrary, tending in the name of public authority and in the interest of a party, to suppress with violence the manifestation of ideas, is an attack on liberty. If it translate itself into law of exile, deportation, transportation, etc., it is then a crime against the sovereignty of the people.

First of all we deny, with Christianity and the Gospel, the legitimacy of lending at interest; we deny it with Judaism and Paganism, with all the philosophers and legislators of antiquity. This first remarkable fact has its value. Usury no sooner appeared in the world than it was denied; legislators and moralists have not ceased to combat it, and if they have not succeeded in annihilating it, at least they have, up to a certain point, deprived it of some of its venom by fixing a *limit*, a legal rate of interest. Such is, therefore, our first proposition: All that is given in the repayment of a loan beyond the loan is usury and spoliation.

But what is not known, and which, perhaps, may astonish many, is that the fundamental negation of interest, in our eyes, does not destroy the principle—the right, if you like—which gives birth to interest, which, in spite of the condemnation of secular and ecclesiastical authorities, is still a right.

* We shall not always adhere to orthodoxy in spelling, but shall not go out of the way to spell "foneticall."

ity, has caused it to endure up to our time. So that the real problem for us is not to know whether usury in itself is illicit. In that respect we are of the same opinion as the Church; or if it have a reason of existence for in that respect we are of the same opinion as the economists. The problem is to know how we shall be able to suppress the abuse without attacking the equal right of every individual.

It is quite true that a loan is a *service*. And as a service is a value, and as it is in the nature of a service to be remunerated, it follows that the loan must have its price, or, to employ the technical term, that it should *bear interest*.

But it is also true, and this truth subsists besides the preceding one, that he who lends, in the ordinary condition of the trade of lender, does not deprive himself of the capital which he lends. On the contrary, he lends it precisely because the lending of it does not constitute a privation for him; he lends because he can make no use of it himself, being already sufficiently provided with capital; he lends it, in fine, because it is not his intention, nor in his power, to use it himself with profit—because by keeping it in his hands this capital, which is sterile in its nature, would remain sterile, whereas by lending it, and by the interest which results from it, it produces a profit which enables the capitalist to live without working.

The proprietor who possesses two domains, one at Tours and the other at Orleans, and who is compelled to fix his residence in the one he exploits, and consequently to abandon the other—can that proprietor say that he deprives himself of his property because he has not ubiquity of action and of domicile, like God? We might just as well say that we are deprived of residence at New York because we live in Paris. It must be admitted, therefore, that the deprivation of the capitalist is the deprivation of the master who has lost his slave, the deprivation of the prince who has been forced to abdicate by his subjects, the deprivation of the robber who, wishing to break into a house, finds the dogs on the alert and the inhabitants at the windows.

Now, in the presence of this affirmation and of this negation, diametrically opposed to each other, both supported by equal reasons, but which do not correspond, and therefore cannot cancel each other, what is to be done? The capitalist persists in his affirmation, and says: You don't want to pay me interest? Very well! I don't want to lend you my capital. Try to work without capital! On our side we persist in our negation, and say: We will not pay you interest, because interest, in social economy, is the price of idleness, the first cause of the inequality of fortunes and of misery. Neither of us giving way, we arrive at stagnation.

It is at this point that the advocate of perfect equality takes up the question. On the one hand is the fact of interest; on the other, the organic impossibility and immorality of this same interest.

Let us suppose that of all the capital I employ, either in the form of machinery or raw material, one-half is lent by you; let us suppose, at the same time, that of all the capital you use in production, one-half is lent by me. It is clear that the interests which we shall have to pay mutually will compensate each other; and if on both sides the capitals advanced are equal, the interests balance, and nothing will be due on either side.

In society things do not happen altogether in this way, no doubt. The loans are far from being equal; therefore the interests paid are not so, and hence the inequality of conditions and fortunes.

But the question to know is if this balance in the loans or advances in capital, labour, and talent, and consequently equality of revenue for all citizens, which in theory is perfectly admissible, can be realised in practice; if this realisation is in the tendencies of society; if, indeed, it be not the fatal conclusion of usury itself?

Anarchist Socialism, which is nothing but economic science, studied in its acquired experience and in the power of its deductions, affirms this.

Indeed, what do the history of civilisation and the history of political economy tell us about this great question of interest?

That the mutual lending of capitals tends to balance more and more, and that by reason of different causes which we will enumerate, and which cannot be ignored by the most reactionary economists.

1. The division of labour, or separation of industries, which, by multiplying machinery and raw material to infinity, multiplies the lending of capitals in the same proportion.

2. The accumulation of capitals, accumulation which results from the variety of industries, the effect of which is to produce a competition among capitalists analogous to that of the merchants, and consequently to operate the reduction of the rate of interest.

3. The ever greater faculty of circulation which capitals acquire by the bill of exchange, currency, etc.

4. Public security.

Such are the general causes which for centuries have brought about a reciprocity of lending more and more balanced, and consequently a more and more equal compensation of interests, a continuous fall in the price of capitals.

These facts cannot be denied. The merit of the progress operated in the domain of industry and of wealth is due, not to capital, but rather to the circulation of capital. The facts being thus analysed and classed, what we have to find is the means of provoking that balance of credit and of revenue by acting directly, not upon capital, understand, but upon circulation, the means of organising this circulation so as to produce at once between the capitalists and the producers two terms at present in opposition, but which theory demonstrates, should be synonymous; equivalence in lending—in other terms, equality of fortunes.

Suppose, first of all, to keep within the present conditions of credit, which is obstructed above all by the intermediary of currency, sup-

pose all the producers in the country, to the number of more than ten millions, assessed themselves each for a sum representing 1 per cent. of their capital. Let us suppose that, with the aid of this assessment, a bank is founded in competition with the (unnamed) Bank of England and others, discounting bills of exchange, etc., and giving credit upon mortgage at $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.

It is evident, in the first place, the discount of bills of exchange, etc., being operated at $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., loans upon mortgage at $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., credit, etc., at $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., money capital would be immediately stricken with absolute unproductivity, interest would be *nil*, and credit gratuitous. If commercial and mortgage credit—in other terms, if money capital, the capital whose exclusive function it is to circulate—were gratuitous, house-capital would soon become the same; houses would no longer be capital, they would be merchandise, quoted in the market like brandy and cheese, and let or sold, two terms which will be then synonymous, at cost price.

If house-capital, the same as money capital were gratuitous, which amounts to saying, if the use of it were paid for by way of exchange, not of loan, land-capital would not be long in becoming gratuitous in its turn; that is to say that rent, instead of being the price of monopoly paid to the idle landlord, would be the compensation of the product among the lands of superior and inferior quality.

HINDS GREEN.

(To be continued.)

THE SEXUAL RELATIONSHIP.

THERE is perhaps no question, with the exception of that of Money, in which the principle of Nationalism is more oppressive and more baneful than in the matter of the sexual relationship. It is difficult to say in either of these questions whether custom or law is the more oppressive.

Because this island has been peopled by races coming from a common stock, or because one strong man succeeded in subjugating all others and in obtaining supremacy over the whole area of the British islands, therefore we have to submit to one arrangement in sexual matters within the area of the United Kingdom. True it is that a very similar custom or arrangement holds in every part of the civilised world, but this uniformity of custom arose from the subjection of the individual to the Governmentalism or Socialism of early tribes; all marriage customs are traceable to early tribal arrangements.

And so, although the dispositions of different individual Englishmen may differ as widely as their physical strength, no account of such difference is taken by the law of the land. Every Englishman, Scotsman or Irishman, who wishes to have connection with the opposite sex, without involving his partner or offspring in any disgrace, must enter into a contract to maintain her for the rest of her born days! Further he may only make such a contract with one woman at a time.

One form of contract and that with only one of the other sex at a time, holds throughout the length and breadth of the kingdom. Either you must put your head into a life-long noose or else your sweetheart is an outcast and your children denied the rights of citizens.

Supposing national government or national custom said every individual Englishman was to eat only white wheat bread; would such a law or custom be more absurd or more tyrannical?

Yet this sexual tyranny like the monetary tyranny is ubiquitous; there is no escaping from it, and he who is brave enough to defy it must be content to face the consequences. The chief agents whereby this tyranny is maintained are the women themselves, who are devoid of all initiative and hardly ever question the sanctity of custom. We do not blame them for their narrowness of ideas, but it is a sad fact which it is necessary to recognise.

Would not variety in this as in all other matters be a blessing? Would it not give more pleasure and health to life? Some are capable of life-long friendship, some incapable, some are constant, some inconstant, some might prefer polygamy, others monogamy; let each live according to his or her nature and not according to national law.

Every man, every woman knows what this tyranny is, and yet so warped are their minds by the fear of others, by the tyranny of ubiquitous custom, that each accepts unthinkingly such custom as right and inevitable. Hardly any man or woman ever conceives the idea of any other marriage system being right than the lifelong monogamic bond. Some people are doubtless happy in such marriage-life, and because a few are so they will make out that the cause of unhappiness in others lies, not in this stupid uniform custom, but in the dispositions of the individuals. You must either enter into this particular form of contract or resort to the brothel.

But why this life-long bond? Yes, that is the question which we will ask again and again, until all the stupid two-legged sheep of the world pluck up courage to ask it themselves. Why not twenty years, ten years, five years, one year, six months? Why should not any one of these contracts be equally good and equally respected in society? Why should only the woman who makes a lifelong contract be respected, whilst she who makes the five minutes' contract is an outcast? Is there any thing peculiarly divine in the one period that is absent from the other?

The truth is that, as far as sanctity in the marriage tie is concerned, the only sanctifying element that can enter into it is Love. So far as this is absent, on the one hand, from the intercourse of the brothel, and on the other hand from the lifelong bond forced upon individuals by custom and law, so far is there nothing sacred or elevating in either, both marriage and prostitution are based.

The natural way by which a woman can prove her love for a man is

to be the father of his children, and were to give an open invitation to such freedom of love by the legal privileges of the marriage bond or by the tyrannical spirit of other women, such union would be duly respected in society, and there would, we think, be little or no desire on the part of the man, on the one hand, to back out of the responsibility, or of the women, on the other hand, to conceal "his shame," or kill the child.

On the other hand, the man can show his love by undertaking to maintain the woman at such times as she requires assistance, provided she remains faithful to him, and also to undertake to assist in the rearing and education of the children.

If the natures of men and women are such as to render such arrangements impossible, then no forcible lifelong bond can render marriage and family life anything else but a sham and a lie. Either they are possible without external force, or they are impossible; and if so the sooner we recognise the truth the better.

In a free society, however, there would doubtless be a variety of methods of sexual co-operation, according to the dispositions of individuals, and we claim that no particular method should be regarded as "respectable" above all others. Let each be regarded as acting rightly when he is true to himself and is not in any way acting the hypocrite.

The marriage custom, in fact, has completely debased the sexual relationship. It makes prostitutes, it helps to spread venereal disease, promotes promiscuity, destroys health and happiness, and creates ten thousand crimes that would never otherwise arise. The marriage laws are a heap of rubbish, like all other instruments of coercion. They have not done one iota of good in the world, but have created an immense amount of misery ; and they embody one of those terrible blunders which man, in his blind wanderings seems destined to make, and for which he has to pay the full penalty before he discovers his mistake.

MAJORITY RULE AND DEMOCRACY.

ACCORDING to political reformers, the highest form of a society is democratic, one in which adult suffrage obtains and the vote is intelligently used. It is argued : The Government will be perfectly constituted and representative if it be a thing no longer in name. With such believers there is no other fundamental principle wanted to render the governed free and happy. Everybody who then wants his way will vote for it, and *the most* will get it ! But the fact will remain that sovereign and subject, governor and governed, will not be extinguished. Government and majority rule are interchangeable expressions, and will not fail to bring forth the same evils in another form, though all the world should unite to have such a perfect Government as may be conceived to result from the bases of adult suffrage.

We require really to be free from the silly notion that it is necessary to govern Mr. So-and-So, whom we have not seen; and if the individual were true to himself, he would as stoutly object to government by the majority as by one man, and very probably more, if he further considered the progeny of evils always accruing from "majoritism."

These neo-governmentalists, these apologists for government, have thus conceived the only alternative for the individual either to govern or to be governed.

This gospel runs as follows:—"You cannot individually, nor even with other willing individuals, put your concurrent thought into action short of the majority of one. You cannot (because, in fact, you must not) gain benefit by your reflections. Indeed, to step into action before you may is, in short, the act of an enemy of society. So all initial and experimental effort must be checked until the majority consents. Now *this* is the highest of all teaching"!!

Thus Government is held up, like Moses's golden serpent, as inevitably a necessity, because the majority is stronger than the minority; but I seek to show that this is an unwarrantable conclusion.

seem to show that this is an unwarivable conclusion. Apart from governmental influence, let us look at the industrial and social activities of a nation, viewing the aggregations of individuals for these purposes as resting in their relations upon strictly business principles. What do we see? Various groups or associations looking after their own interest, to be sure. (It is not essential here to observe that the landlords and capitalists get the lion's share.) How is this business conducted? Does the majority of some branch of industry dictate its terms as law to another association, and visit upon it penalties for the breach of them? Could it?

Does any majority of any business association say in effect to another : You must sell to us at such a price, or You must buy of us at such a price ? Such acts are the acts of government.

Majorities neither behave to minorities or other majorities in this way. Majorities do not govern, they contract. In the place of laws they quote their tariffs. Instead of decreeing, they solicit. Instead of prescribing, be it enacted! they advertise for patronage. Instead of taxing, they give a bonus.

It is the same with insurance societies, benefit societies, and others of the respective administrative majorities of which have no conceivable influence of a governmental kind upon each other.

Here we have the guarantee of group autonomy in the guise of collective action and the principle of free contract, the bases of these operations.

At worst, if any association divides, the minority can secede down to only one, and procure compensation, i.e., withdraw his interest, unless he had in his contract with the others stipulated the forfeiture of such under the circumstances.

So involved in group autonomy is individual autonomy. Herein we reveal that, so far as governmental inclusion can be considered as a merit, there is sufficient evidence to try to show initial freedom, a system of free contract and a guarantee of the adaptive and modifying agencies in process of subverting all human institutions to individual ends and purposes (government excepted).

Instead of learning from business and daily experience to fear the institution of government, we are asked to blindly remodel it upon the principle of mutual tyranny.

If individuals are true to themselves, and really aspire to liberty and happiness, they will determine to arrange government with all other human institutions, i.e., they will demand that it be based upon precisely

the same footing, viz., the voluntary principle, when it shall no longer be a monstrous anomaly. Government will then negate its patent of depirature, and lose its past nature and become a purely protective association, deriving its efficiency from the only true tenure, viz., individual consent and support, liable to lose patronage if it proves faithless, and be succeeded by rivals, and sure of individual patronage whilst it proves and continues faithful.

F. A. MATTHEWS.

THE POST-OFFICE MONOPOLY.

Those who have hitherto believed that the monopoly of letter-carrying by State Governments is, for some mysterious reason, a necessity of our existence and a most beneficent arrangement, will be informed on the pages of this paper of the sole purpose for which the monopoly has been established and maintained. Regarding letter-carrying as one of those necessary functions with which we cannot well dispense, there is nevertheless no ground in the nature of the function itself which warrants its being performed solely by Government. If our readers will inquire into the history of this monopoly, they will find that its chief purpose is to place in the hands of the "authorities" the power of opening letters and of stopping or delaying communications which appear to be at all of a "seditious" nature.

It will be hardly necessary to refresh the memory of some of the leading Socialists in this matter, but an instance was brought forward the other day, at the Postmen's Union, by Mr. Boynes, which will serve to show to what dirty tricks people will stoop with the aid of the "grace of God."

Mr. Boynes said he had written the following letter to the Postmaster General:—

"Sir,—On the morning of Saturday, August 16th, at 11 o'clock, I posted several postcards addressed to clubs in this district (Finsbury), asking them to get volunteers to carry collection-boxes on the following day (Sunday), at the Dockers' Demonstration, on behalf of the dismissed postmen. These postcards were not delivered until the Monday, and were consequently too late for the purpose they were intended for. Can you explain this to us?"

Mr. Boynes said he received a letter from Sir Arthur Blackwood asking for further information. That had been sent, but no further reply had been received.

Now, we would ask our readers whether such dirty tricks as this are essential to social order, whether they could be performed by any private firm with impunity, and whether it does not show Government to be nothing but a mean conspiracy against the liberties of the people! It is vain to talk of a Government controlled by the people; the very nature of the institution makes those who manage it indifferent to popular interests, because they know that the majority of an indifferent nation must be stirred up before they can lose their comfortable posts—at the next election.

THE SOCIALIST FALLACY.

SOCIALISM is shallow, as everyone listening to the wearisome repetitions of its advocates in the parks and street corners, or attempting to digest such meaningless twaddle as the "Fabian Essays" and other publications, can tell. The root of the Social Question lies, say the Socialists, in the private ownership of land and the means of labour. This is their unproved, meaningless assertion, which they never weary of repeating.

But the socialistic fallacy—a fallacy which is common not only to avowed Socialists, but to all advocates of Government interference with private enterprise, such, for example, as Professors Thorold Rogers and Bonamy Price—is that wherever evils have arisen in State-controlled enterprises, the remedy lies not in the abolition of such State control, but in more State interference.

This is a fallacy which manifests itself over and over again, and one into which every shallow political and social thinker falls. It is so easy to do so.

Here are railways, which are State-licensed and to a large extent State-regulated. They have made various by-laws which, though directly bearing upon the people who patronise the railways, have nevertheless been submitted to their approval, but have only received the approval of a certain set of indifferent good-for-nothings at Westminster. Now one would think that the remedy for any high-handed and tyrannical conduct on the part of these railway companies would be for the people to form associations for the purpose of bringing them to terms, under threat of boycotting or of establishing rival railways. But no, say the shallow states, the remedy is for the *State to take over the railways*. What jackasses! They have no reasons for their proposals, and they shut their eyes firmly to the teachings of experience in the

matter of State purchase and State control of industries. But what does that matter? It forms an item for a political program, and will make a famous politician of some ambitious knave.

Then there is the land, held under a system of landlordism which sweats the people to the tune of some £300,000,000 per annum. It would be very desirable to get rid of this burden, to repudiate property in land, and establish some freer arrangement based upon use as a title for ownership. Yes, it would be a relief; but no, we are not to enjoy this degree of liberty. The Socialists and Land Nationalisers get the ears of the shallow-minded majority in favour of that wonderful time-honoured institution, the State, establishing a monopoly of all the land of the country and buying out the landlords (as it undoubtedly would) at a nice round sum, and expecting the people to support them to eternity.

Never heed the teachings of history in the past, O shallow pates! Shut your eyes to the fact that the State has always deceived and swindled and sweated you, and that it is the most cumbersome machine to work, ever creating National Questions in every department of life in which it interferes; that to bring about any trilling reform in it requires the bellowing of all the stump orators and windbags up and down the country for years—aye, for generations. Never heed this! Let us, say the Socialists, have more State interference and more State monopoly.

Why look, simpletons, at the way in which the Guelph family manage to keep themselves going at the popular expense, in spite of the ridicule that Democrats have heaped upon them for generations, in spite of the Radicals and Republicans and all the other popular parties.

Then there is the question of banking, which has never, except in a few solitary instances, been free from State control, and yet its failures are invariably attributed to liberty, and State control is increased. Although State finances have led to some of the most terrible disasters, yet people shut their eyes to these facts, and still place their confidence in this monster.

The teetotallers nearly fall into the same error. They don't, as far as I know, advocate that the State should take over the public-houses, but they attribute the State-made Drink Question to anything but its true causes, namely, the want of proper competition in the matter of selling refreshments, and the enslavement of labour arising from submission to national laws regarding property and money.

The Socialists are simply a set of people who carry this shallow reasoning to an extreme, and advocate that every industry and every article of property should be directly controlled by the State or by the Municipality.

We claim, however, that most social and industrial evils are traceable to the Socialism that already exists, and that they will be only removed by perfect freedom of competition in all industries.

WHAT ANARCHISTS WANT.

ANARCHISTS seek, in the first place, to set themselves free from all territorial government. They are not contented with the mere liberty to "vote"; they wish to realise the fullest individual liberty of action in all matters. They protest against the over-riding of the individual judgment of peaceful citizens, and claim that citizens themselves can best judge when others are trespassing upon their liberty, or when they trespass upon that of others. They seek, therefore, to combat the disorderly, tyrannical spirit which the existence of territorial governments perpetuates and cherishes, and to instil in men's minds the necessity for respecting the liberty of others as the first principle of social order.

As long, therefore, as these governments last, and men are delighted and blinded with the "liberty to vote," they will be induced through the agency of the vote and the various armed officials at the command of governments to do rude, brutal, impertinent, and dishonest acts which they would never think of directly perpetrating upon their nabers. They are induced, however, to do these acts through the agency of governmental officials, because they unthinkingly believe that there is something divine about these institutions and their employes. The only divine features about governments, however, are their antiquity and their brutality.

But people will find, sooner or later, that they have been entirely deceived. They will find that rude, brutal, impertinent acts, when committed through the indirect agency of officials, are just as injurious in their effects as when directly performed by citizens themselves towards one another. Hence, just as men and women have learnt "manners" in their direct association with one another, so it is probable, or at any rate equally desirable, that they will learn to abstain from committing any breach of manners by any roundabout or indirect method.

It is nothing but this rudeness to one another that makes society unhappy. A Democratic Government would be no more beneficial to society than any other form of government, unless its officials could act towards citizens as fellow-citizens; but such a government could not maintain itself. When people say that a government is necessary, they mean that they think insolence and violence towards one's unoffending fellow-citizens is necessary; for as far as the protection of person and property is concerned, that, of course, could be done by free associations, and no more requires government than churning butter.

Governments are simply robber gangs, engaged in enabling people to rob through the agency of superstition. With, undoubtedly, the idea to be carried on to an extent to which it could never have been carried by private enterprise.

But what is it that Anarchists particularly want? They want free-

dom of individual judgment in all matters, and free competition in the performance of all the functions which governments now monopolise. No rigid regulations to tell the individual what to do, except when the individual himself judges it to be necessary. With this end in view, they repudiate all politics as being antagonistic to their principles, and do not seek either to use the vote or to obtain a single measure by political means. Individual freedom to compete with the State and Municipalities, both in the management of industries and in the making of laws; these are our demands.

PAPERS WE CAN RECOMMEND.

Liberty.—We give this the first place, as there are few Anarchists in England who are not largely indebted to Benjamin H. Tucker for his clear and consistent expositions of Anarchism. The paper has been in existence for many years, and has never sacrificed principle for popularity. It may be obtained either from its editor, Box 3,366, Boston, Mass., U.S.A., or a few copies may be had in England, from A. Tarn, 27, St. John's Hill Grove, New Wandsworth, S.W., post free, 2d., published fortnightly. Mr. Tucker also has on sale an extensive library of Anarchist literature, which is generally advertised on the back of his paper.

Personal Rights Journal, Edited by J. H. Levy, the organ of the Association for the Defence of Personal Rights, is an excellent monthly Individualist paper so far as it goes, although the editor is in favour of forcibly suppressing the liberty of the individual who refuses to support the particular form of government which he (the editor) approves of. However, the paper is worth reading, and may be had from the Free-thought Publishing Company, 63, Fleet Street, E.C.

Free Life.—Another Individualist paper, edited weekly by Auberon Herbert. The editor is warmly in favour of the liberty of buying and selling, and is also in favour of "Voluntary Taxation." Professed to be a "thoroughgoing" Individualist paper, it is, however, in favour of compulsory association for the protection of person and property; and whilst rejecting the politician and all his ways, seeks to realise "Voluntary Taxation" through the agency of a political party. The decline in the amount of "conscience money" received by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, does not promise well for the success of Voluntary Taxation. We recommend our readers to buy the paper, as it contains many good articles. It is published by the proprietor at the Mercury Press, High Street, Bedford.

Freedom.—A monthly organ of Anarchist-Communism; occasionally contains good Anarchist articles, but is largely a Socialist paper, and has great faith in strikes. Its promoters, however, take up an anti-political position, and in this they may do good by destroying the workman's faith in politics. Its price is 1d., and it may be obtained from the Labour Press, 57, Chancery Lane, London, W.C.

"AND so the reliance on property, including the reliance on Governments which protect it, is the want of self-reliance. Men have looked away from themselves and at things so long that they have come to esteem the religions, learned, and civil institutions as guards of property, and they deprecate assaults on these because they feel them to be assaults on property. They measure their esteem of each other by what each has, and not by what each is. But a cultivated man becomes ashamed of his property, out of a new respect for his nature. Especially he hates what he has if he sees that it is accidental—come to him by inheritance, or gift, or crime; then he feels that it is not worth having; it does not belong to him, has no root in him, and merely lies there because no revolution or no robber takes it away. But that which a man is he does always by necessity acquire, and what the man acquires is living property, which does not wait the beck of rulers or mobs, or revolutions or fire, or storm or bankruptcies, but perpetually renews itself wherever the man breathes. 'Thy lot or portion of life,' said the Caliph Ali, is seeking after thee; therefore be at rest from seeking after it.' Our dependence upon these foreign goods leads us to our slavish respect for numbers. The political parties meet in numerous conventions; the greater the concourse, and with each new uproar of announcement, 'The Delegation from Essex!' 'The Democrats from New Hampshire!' 'The Whigs of Maine!' the young patriot feels himself stronger than before by a new thousand of eyes and arms. In like manner the reformers summon conventions, and vote and resolve in the multitude. Not so, O friends, will the God deign to enter and inhabit you, but by a method precisely the reverse. It is only as a man puts off all foreign support, and stands alone, that I see him to be strong and to prevail. He is weaker by every recruit to his banner. Is not a man better than a town? Ask nothing of men, and in the end, less mutation than you, firm column, must presently appear the upholder of all that surrounds thee."—Ralph Waldo Emerson.

NOTICES.

All communications should be addressed to THE EDITOR, care of The Labour Press, 57, Chancery Lane, W.C.
The next number, which will appear in November, will deal with the Land Question, Money Question, Drink Question, and various other questions, for the existence of which we are indebted to stupid and conceited lawmakers.

CO-OPERATION:

ITS LAWS AND PRINCIPLES.

28pp. Price 6d.; post free 8d. May be had from the Editor at the LABOUR PRESS, LIMITED, 57, CHANCERY LANE, W.C.

THE LABOUR PRESS, LTD.

57, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, W.C.

Co-operative and Trade Union Printery.

Printed and published for A. TARN at the Labour Press Limited (Co-operative Society), 57, Chancery Lane, London, W.C.